arXiv:1407.1241v1 [math.OC] 4 Jul 2014

Characterizations of objective sets and objective functions

C. Zălinescu
University Alexandru Ioan Cuza Iaşi, Faculty of Mathematics
700506 Iaşi, Romania (email: zalinesc@uaic.ro).

Abstract. In this short note we give characterizations for objective sets and objective functions as defined in D. Y. Gao and C. Wu's paper arxiv:1104.2970v2.

1 Objective sets and objective functions

In [4] one can read the following:

"Mathematical definitions of the objective set and objective function are given in the book [9] (Chapter 6, page 288). Let

$\mathcal{Q} = \{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m} \mid Q^T = Q^{-1},\ \det Q = 1\}$

be a proper orthogonal rotation group.

Definition 1 (Objectivity and Isotropy) A subset $\mathcal{Y}_a \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is said to be *objective* if $Qy \in \mathcal{Y}_a\ \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}_a$ and $\forall Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. A real-valued function $T : \mathcal{Y}_a \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *objective* if its domain is objective and

$T(Qy) = T(y)\ \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}_a$ and $\forall Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. (2)

A subset $\mathcal{Y}_a \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is said to be *isotropic* if $yQ^T \in \mathcal{Y}_a\ \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}_a$ and $\forall Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. A real-valued function $T : \mathcal{Y}_a \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *isotropic* if its domain is isotropic and

$T(yQ^T) = T(y)\ \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}_a$ and $\forall Q \in Q$. (3)".

The reference [9] above is our reference [1]. Because Q is an $m \times m$ (orthogonal) matrix, in order to calculate Qy for $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ one must consider y as a column vector. Of course, Q^T is also an $m \times m$-matrix. Because we don't know what is meant by yQ^T in such a case, in the sequel we deal only with objective sets and objective functions in the sense mentioned above.

Let us also see how these notions are defined in Definition 6.1.2 in [1]:

"**Definition 6.1.2 (Objectivity and Isotropy)**

(D1) *Objective Set and Objective Function*: A subset $\mathcal{A}_a \subset \mathcal{M}$ is said to be *objective* if for every $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}_a$ and every $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{M}^+_{ort}$, $\mathbf{QA} \in \mathcal{A}_a$. A scalar-valued function $U : \Omega \times \mathcal{A}_a \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *objective* if its domain is objective and

$U(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{QA}) = U(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) \quad \forall \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}_a, \quad \forall \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{M}^+_{ort}.$ (6.20)

(D2) *Isotropic Set and Isotropic Function* . A subset $\mathcal{A}_a \subset \mathcal{M}$ is said to be isotropic if for every $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}_a$ and every $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{M}^+_{ort}$ also $\mathbf{AQ}^T \in \mathcal{A}_a$. A scalar valued function $U : \Omega \times \mathcal{A}_a \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *isotropic* if its domain is isotropic and

$U(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{AQ}^T) = U(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}) \quad \forall \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}_a, \quad \forall \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{M}^+_{ort}.$ (6.21)".

The set $\mathcal{M}$ appearing in [1, Def. 6.1.2], as well as a set $\mathcal{A}$, are defined on page 287 of [1]:

"We use the notation $\mathcal{M}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^{m\times n})$, or simply $\mathcal{M}$, to denote the space of all second-order tensor functions with domain Ω in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and range in $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be an admissible deformation gradient space, defined by

$\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{M} \mid \operatorname{rank} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{X}) = \min\{m, n\} \ \ \forall \mathbf{X} \in \Omega\}$. (6.16)".

For us Definition 6.1.2 is not sufficiently clear because $\Omega \times \mathcal{A}_a$ does not seem to be an objective set. This is the reason to use Definition 1 for our characterization of objective sets and objective functions.

Observe that in the first version of [4] one finds another definition of an objective function which doesn't seem to be equivalent to that in Definition 1 above. Indeed, in [3] one can read:

"By the fact that this potentially useful theory is based on certain fundamental principles in physics, the nonconvex term $W(x)$ is required to be an *objective function*, i.e., there exists a *geometrically nonlinear mapping* $\Lambda : \mathcal{X}_a \to \mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ and a canonical function $V : \mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $W(x) = V(\Lambda(x)) \ \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_a$."

Almost the same text can be found in [2, p. 118].[1]

2 Characterizations of objective sets and objective functions

In the sequel $\mathbb{R}^m$ ($m \geq 1$) is endowed with the usual inner product, and the elements of $\mathbb{R}^m$ are considered as being $m \times 1$ matrices. Let set

$$\mathcal{Q}_m := \left\{Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m} \mid Q^T Q = I_m, \ \det Q = 1\right\}.$$

Lemma 1 *Let $m \geq 2$ and $u, v \in S^{m-1} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|x\| = 1\}$. Then there exists $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_m$ such that $Qu = v$.*

Proof. Consider first the case $m = 2$. Then there exist $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 2\pi)$ such that $u = [\cos\alpha \ \ \sin\alpha]^T$, $v = [\cos\beta \ \ \sin\beta]^T$. Taking

$$Q_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\beta-\alpha) & -\sin(\beta-\alpha) \\ \sin(\beta-\alpha) & \cos(\beta-\alpha) \end{bmatrix},$$

clearly $Q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}_2$ and $v = Q_2 u$. If $m \geq 3$, take $X \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ a linear subspace containing u, v, then consider a orthonormal basis $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_m$ in $\mathbb{R}^m$ with $e_1, e_2 \in X$. With respect to this basis take Q of the form

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} Q_2 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{m-2} \end{bmatrix},$$

where Q_2 is defined as above and I_k is the identity matrix of order k. It is clear that $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_m$ and $Qu = v$.

Proposition 2 *Let $m \geq 2$, $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ a nonempty set, and $f : A \to E$.*

(i) *A is objective if and only if there exists $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ a nonempty set such that $A = \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1} := \{tx \mid t \in \Gamma, \ x \in S^{m-1}\}$.*

(ii) *f is objective if and only if there exist $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ a nonempty set and a function $\varphi : \Gamma \to E$ such that $A = \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1}$ and $f(x) = \varphi(\|x\|)$ for every $x \in A$.*

(iii) *Every nonempty subset A of $\mathbb{R}$ is objective and any function $f : A \to E$ is objective.*

[1] This paper is contained in the file `http://www.confmame.ru/documents/pdf/p1MAME'IV.pdf`.

Proof. (i) Let first have $A = \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1}$ with $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ nonempty. Consider $x \in A$ and $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_m$. Then $x = \gamma u$ with $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $u \in S^{m-1}$. It follows that $Qx = \gamma Qu$. Since $Q^T Q = I_m$, we get $\|Qu\|^2 = (Qu)^T Qu = u^T Q^T Qu = u^T I_m u = u^T u = \|u\|^2 = 1$, whence $Qu \in S^{m-1}$. Hence $Qx \in \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1} = A$.

Assume now that A is objective, and set $\Gamma := \{\|x\| \mid x \in A\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$. Clearly, $A \subset \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1}$. Consider $x \in \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1}$, that is $x = \gamma u$ with $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $u \in S^{m-1}$. Since $\gamma \in \Gamma$, there exists $y \in A$ such that $\gamma = \|y\|$. If $\gamma = 0$ then $0 = y \in A$, whence $x = \gamma \cdot 0 = 0 \in A$. Assume that $\gamma \neq 0$. Then $v := \gamma^{-1} y \in S^{m-1}$. By Lemma 1, there exists $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_m$ such that $u = Qv$. It follows that $x = \gamma u = \gamma Qv = Qy$. Since A is objective, it follows that $x \in A$. Hence $A = \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1}$.

(ii) Assume first that there exist $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ a nonempty set with $A = \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1}$ and a function $\varphi : \Gamma \to E$ such that $f(x) = \varphi(\|x\|)$ for every $x \in A$; hence A is objective by (i). Since $\|Qx\| = \|x\|$ for every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_m$, it is clear that f is objective.

Conversely, assume that f is objective. By the very definition, A is objective, and so, by (i), there exists $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ a nonempty set such that $A = \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1}$. Fix some $u_0 \in S^{m-1}$ and take $\varphi : \Gamma \to E$ defined by $\varphi(t) := f(tu_0)$. Consider $x \in A$; then $\gamma := \|x\| \in \Gamma$. If $\gamma = 0$, then $x = 0 = \gamma u_0$, and so $f(x) = f(\gamma u_0) = \varphi(\gamma) = \varphi(\|x\|)$. Assume that $\gamma > 0$. Then $u := \gamma^{-1} x \in S^{m-1}$. By Lemma 1 there exists $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_m$ such that $u = Qu_0$, whence $x = Q(\gamma u_0)$. Since f is objective, it follows that $f(x) = f\left(Q(\gamma u_0)\right) = f(\gamma u_0) = \varphi(t) = \varphi(\|x\|)$.

(iii) Clearly, $\mathcal{Q}_1 = \{[1]\} = \{I_1\}$. The conclusion follows.

Corollary 3 *Let $m \geq 2$ and $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. Consider $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ a nonempty set such that $A \neq \{0\}$ and $f : A \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(x) := x^T H x$. Then f is objective if and only if there exist $\emptyset \neq \Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $A = \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1}$ and $\frac{1}{2}(H + H^T) = \alpha I_m$.*

Proof. Setting $H_s := \frac{1}{2}(H + H^T)$, we have that $f(x) := x^T H_s x$ for $x \in A$. So we may (and do) assume that $H = H_s$.

The sufficiency is obvious because, by Proposition 2 (i), A is objective and $f(x) = \alpha \|x\|^2$ for $x \in A$. Hence f is objective by Proposition 2 (ii) (with $\varphi(t) = \alpha t^2$).

Assume that f is objective. By Proposition 2 (ii), there exist $\emptyset \neq \Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\varphi : \Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $A = \Gamma \cdot S^{m-1}$ and $f(x) = \varphi(\|x\|)$ for $x \in A$. Fixing $u_0 \in S^{m-1}$, for $t_0 \in \Gamma \setminus \{0\}$ we have that

$$\varphi(t_0) = f(t_0 u_0) = f(t_0 u) = (t_0 u)^T H (t_0 u) = t_0^2 u^T H u = \alpha t_0^2 \quad \forall u \in S^{m-1},$$

where $\alpha := u_0^T H u_0$. It follows $u^T H u = \alpha u^T I_m u$ for every $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and so $H_s = H = \alpha I_m$. The proof is complete.

References

[1] D. Y. Gao. *Duality principles in nonconvex systems*, volume 39 of *Nonconvex Optimization and its Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2000. Theory, methods and applications.

[2] D. Y. Gao and C. Wu. On the triality theory in global optimization. In L. Nazarova, editor, *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Mathematics, its Applications and Mathematical Education MAME'11*, volume I, pages 117–122. East-Siberian State University of Technology, June 2011.

[3] D. Y. Gao and C. Wu. On the Triality Theory in Global Optimization (I) Unconstrained Problems. 2011, arxiv:1104.2970v1 [math.OC].

[4] D. Y. Gao and C. Wu. Triality Theory for General Unconstrained Global Optimization Problems. 2012, arxiv:1104.2970v2 [math.OC].